

**BY ORDER OF THE COMMANDER  
AIR FORCE SPACE COMMAND**



**AIR FORCE SPACE COMMAND INSPECTION  
CHECKLIST 25-1**

**2 NOVEMBER 1998**

**Logistics Staff**

**SUPPORT AGREEMENT MANAGERS,  
MANPOWER OFFICES AND FINANCIAL  
MANAGEMENT OFFICES**

---

**NOTICE:** This publication is available digitally at: <http://midway.spacecom.af.mil/pubs>. If you lack access, contact your Publishing Distribution Office (PDO).

---

OPR: LGXP (Lawrence Rutherford)  
Supersedes AFSPCSIG 90-253, 1 Oct 95.

Certified by: LGX (Col David R. Noble)  
Pages: 5  
Distribution: F

---

This checklist reflects Command requirements for managers to prepare for and conduct internal reviews in the functional area of support agreement management. It applies to all subordinate units with support agreement responsibilities.

### **SUMMARY OF REVISIONS**

This revision has been completely revised to align the checklist with [AFI 25-201](#), *Support Agreement Procedures*, [AFI 25-201AFSPC1](#), *Support Agreement Procedures*, [AFPD 90-2](#), *Inspection General - The Inspection System*, and current compliance inspection policy.

1. References have been provided for each critical item. Critical items have been kept to a minimum and are related to public law, safety, security, fiscal responsibility, and/or mission accomplishment. While compliance with non-critical items is not rated, these items help gauge the effectiveness/efficiency of the function.
2. This publication establishes a baseline checklist. The checklist will also be used by the Command IG during applicable assessments. Use the checklist at [Attachment 1](#) as a guide only. Add to or modify each area as needed, to ensure an effective and thorough review of the unit support agreements program.

JOHN D. LADIEU, Col, USAF  
Director of Logistics

**Attachment 1**

**SUPPORT AGREEMENT MANAGERS, FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT OFFICES, AND MAN-POWER OFFICES**

**Table A1.1. Checklist.**

<b>SECTION 1: MAJCOM (MISSION SUPPORT)</b>			
<b>MISSION STATEMENT:</b> Sets policy/procedures for managing the support agreement program for AFSPC units. Reviews and evaluates AFSPC support agreement program and provides assistance in resolving impasse situations. <i>Note:</i> All references are from AFI 25-201, unless otherwise stated.			
<b>1.1. CRITICAL ITEMS:</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A</b>
1.1.1. Has the MAJCOM Program Manager established the level of approval authority for support agreements? (para 2.1.1)			
1.1.2. Has the Program Manager elevated impasses to HQ USAF when they cannot be resolved at the MAJCOM? (para 2.1.1)			
1.1.3. Does the Program Manager measure the command support agreement process? (para 2.1.1)			
<b>1.2. NON-CRITICAL ITEMS:</b>			
<b>1.2.1.</b> Are MAJCOM instructions published when necessary? (para 2.1.1)			
1.2.2. Has MAJCOM Financial Management provided guidance and training necessary to support financial management personnel and resource managers at base level? (para 2.1.2)			
1.2.3. Has MAJCOM Manpower Office validated manpower annexes to support agreements and ensure transfer of manpower resources? (para 2.1.3)			
<b>SECTION 2: NUMBERED AIR FORCE</b>			
<b>MISSION STATEMENT:</b> To ensure units have agreements in place, which provide adequate support services to meet wartime requirements. <i>Note:</i> All references are from AFI 25-201, unless otherwise stated.			
<b>2.1 CRITICAL ITEMS:</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A</b>
2.1.1. Has the NAF Program Manager ensured critical support requirements found in support agreements are identified in war or contingency plans? (para 1.4.2)			
2.1.2. Support agreements normally remain in force during mobilization or other emergencies. Is the Program Manager aware of impasses, terminations, or other circumstances, which could limit the war, fighting effort of the subordinate unit? (AFI 38-101, para 3.2.1)			

<b>SECTION 3: WING SUPPORT AGREEMENT MANAGE</b>			
<b>MISSION STATEMENT:</b> To provide commanders with the capability to document the use of base support resources, ensure they are expended wisely, collect reimbursements and help eliminate unnecessary resource duplication. <i>Note:</i> All references are from AFI 25-201, unless otherwise stated.			
<b>3.1 CRITICAL ITEMS:</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A</b>
3.1.1. Are agreements completed in the DoDI 4000.19 format? (para 1.1.2) (Number of agreements completed using DD Form 1144 / Number of completed agreements)			
3.1.2. Has the Support Agreement Manager (SAM) provided the agreements to Logistic Plans functions to review support requirements, which must be documented in applicable plans? (para 1.4.2)			
3.1.3. Has the SAM established procedures to prevent unnecessary delays in negotiating, revising, and reviewing support agreements? (para 2.2.1)			
3.1.4. Has the Installation Environmental Office reviewed support agreements for environmental concerns and the agreement signed by the Civil Engineer? (para 2.7) (Number of agreements signed by the Civil Engineer / Total number of completed agreements)			
3.1.5. Has the Support Agreement Manager (SAM) fully coordinated agreements with the Functional Area Agreement Coordinators (FAAC), base manpower, and Financial Management? (paras 2.5.1, 4.2.2 and 4.3)			
3.1.6. Is coordination documentation maintained by the SAM for each agreement? (AFI 25-201AFSPC1, para 5.2.4)			
3.1.7. Is a triennial review of the support agreements being concluded 3 years from the effective date? (para 5.4.2) (Total number of agreements exceeding the triennial review date / Total number of completed agreements)			
3.1.8. Does the SAM maintain a complete file of support agreements for the wing? The original support agreement is on file where AFSPC is the supplier. (AFI 25-201AFSPC1, para 5.3.3) (Total number of completed agreements on file / Total number of completed agreements)			
3.1.9 Does the SAM aggressively pursue resolution of negotiation problems and finalization of support agreements? (AFI 25-201AFSPC1, para 5)			
<b>3.2 NON-CRITICAL ITEMS:</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A</b>
3.2.1. Are support agreements properly used to document base operating services, funding or reimbursement arrangements rather than MOA/MOUs? (para 1.2.2)			
3.2.2. Has the SAM trained the staff Functional Area Agreement Coordinators (FAAC)? (para 2.2.1)			
3.2.3. Have impasses been elevated to higher authority only when the local negotiation process is exhausted? (para 5.5.1)			

3.2.4. When a support category cannot be resolved at installation level, does the SAM omit the impasse category and conclude the agreement using the impasse statement? (para 5.5.1)			
3.2.5. Has the SAM trained unit support agreement monitors? (AFI 25-201AFSPC1, para 2.2.1)			
3.2.6 Have goals and metrics been established to measure the effectiveness of the support agreements program? (AFI 25-201AFSPC1, para 2.2.1)			
3.2.7. Has the wing developed criterion that determines the level of coordination required? (AFI 25-201AFSPC1, para 5.2.1)			
3.2.8. Are manpower annexes utilized when the support requirements may necessitate a transfer of manpower positions? (AFI 25-201AFSPC1, para 5.2.3)			
3.2.9. Are delegation letters on file where agreements are approved by other than the wing commander or vice commander? (AFI 25-201AFSPC1, para 5.3.2)			
3.2.10. Are triennial reviews initiated by the AFSPC supplier at least 180 days prior to the anniversary date? When AFSPC is the receiver, are written requests for a triennial review sent to the installation supplier 180 days before the anniversary date? (AFI 25-201AFSPC1, para 5.4.2.1)			
3.2.11. Are receiver delays of over 180 days reported to HQ LGXP? (AFI 25-201AFSPC1, para 5.5.2)			
3.2.12. Are disagreements exceeding 90 days brought to the attention of HQ AFSPC/LGX or the functional manager as appropriate? (AFI 25-201AFSPC1, para 5.5.1)			
3.2.13. Has the SAM submitted a monthly agreement status report to HQ AFSPC/LGXP prior to the 10th of each month? (AFI 25-201AFSPC1, para 5.7.1)			
3.2.14. Are sequential AFSPC agreement numbers being used to identify unique agreements? (AFI 25-201AFSPC1, para A.2.1, 22nd Bullet)			
3.2.15. Does each support agreement where AFSPC is the supplier contain a description of the receiver which shows such information as mission, numbers of personnel, numbers of aircraft or other major equipment, etc.? (AFI 25-201AFSPC1, para A.2.1, 23rd Bullet)			
3.2.16. Has a wing Installation Support Services Catalog (ISSC) been developed and is it used as the source for creating support agreements? (AFI 25-201AFSPC1, para A.2.1, 25th Bullet)			
3.2.17. Does the SAM use the Support Agreement Management System (SAMS)? (AFI 25-201AFSPC1, para 5.7.1)			

<b>SECTION 4: WING FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT OFFICE</b>			
<b>MISSION STATEMENT:</b> To ensure costs for base support are documented correctly in support agreements and collect expected reimbursements. <i>Note:</i> All references are from AFI 25-201, unless otherwise stated.			
<b>4.1. CRITICAL ITEMS:</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A</b>
4.1.1. Are cost factors and support costs for agreements provided by financial management and included in agreements? (paras 2.6, 4.3.1 and 4.3.2)			
4.1.2. Does the FM accomplish the annual budget review and compare reimbursements collected with actual support agreement calculations? (para 2.6.2)			
4.1.3. Does the Financial Management Office (FM) work with DFAS organizations to ensure the accomplishment of actual billing of support? (para 2.6.2)			
4.1.4. Does the FM identify funding responsibilities in support agreements? (para 2.6.2)			
4.1.5. Are reimbursement computations listed documented in sufficient detail to provide an audit trail? (para 4.3.4)			
<b>4.2. NON-CRITICAL ITEMS:</b>			
4.2.1. Has the FM verified Functional Area Agreements Coordinators (FAAC) are submitting billing for reimbursable support to the FM or Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) on a timely basis? (para 2.4.1)			
4.2.2. Has the FM ensured the receiver's reimbursable and non-reimbursable direct incremental cost requirements are included in the supplier's annual financial plan? (para 2.6.2)			
<b>SECTION 5: WING MANPOWER OFFICE MISSION STATEMENT: To accurately document manpower requirements for base support services</b> <i>Note:</i> All references are from AFI 25-201, unless otherwise stated.			
<b>5.1. NON-CRITICAL:</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A</b>
5.1.1. Has the manpower office reviewed all support agreements for manpower impact? (paras 2.5.1 and 4.4)			